



Class E 713

Book A 655

Author _____

Title Proceeding following luncheon
of Anti-Imperialist League
Oct. 22, 1906

Imprint _____



*You are earnestly asked to hand this,
after reading, to some other person who
will also give it careful consideration.*

PROCEEDINGS
FOLLOWING THE LUNCHEON
GIVEN BY THE
Anti-Imperialist League

MONDAY, OCTOBER 22

AT THE ROOMS OF THE TWENTIETH
CENTURY CLUB

TO

Hon. James H. Blount

PUBLISHED BY
THE ANTI-IMPERIALIST LEAGUE
20 CENTRAL STREET, BOSTON

E713

.A623

792

PROCEEDINGS

Mr. Moorfield Storey called the meeting to order.

MR. MOORFIELD STOREY'S REMARKS

Ladies and Gentlemen of the Anti-Imperialist League: It is very pleasant to meet you here in such goodly numbers as we begin a new annual campaign of active agitation in favor of Filipino independence. On this occasion we are here to provide ourselves with fresh ammunition. From your experience with me you know that on most occasions I am not averse to speaking, but on this occasion, I am here to listen. I believe that there are two serious vices into which a presiding officer may readily fall. One is to introduce the speaker of the evening in a speech of such length as more or less to take away the freshness of the speaker's ammunition and the other is to talk about it from an entirely erroneous standpoint, so that the speaker is obliged to spend his time in correcting the mistatements that may have been made; so I shall content myself with introducing to you Judge Blount.

JUDGE BLOUNT'S SPEECH.

It is a matter of very great concern to me that I shall say nothing in this country that I shall be ashamed for my friends in the Philippines to hear. When you have served beyond the seas for six or seven years you have grown close to the people over there. "I have eaten their bread and salt. The deaths that they died I have watched beside and the lives that they led were mine." Therefore, I have determined that I shall say nothing except in a spirit of judicial fairness about the situation there. I am an Anti-Imperialist for the reason that "I do not know the method of drawing an indictment against a whole people." To be specific, in the fall of 1904, during the presidential campaign in the United States, there was an insurrection going on in the Island of Samar. Fifty thousand people

had been made homeless by the operations of a band of brigands, as testified before my court by an officer of the constabulary of that province. The brigandage law is an outgrowth first of the sedition law and, with all due respect to the Secretary of War, it is absolutely an untenable position to say that there is no political significance to the brigandage now going on in those islands. It is simply to deny the proposition that post-bellum brigandage always represents the embers of a late war. Now if the Secretary can prove that to you, he can do more than any public man that I know of in the world. In what I shall say I shall try to be fair; and before going further, permit me to say that I was very much pained to find that one of your Boston papers had not correctly quoted me in what I said last Saturday at the luncheon of the 20th Century Club, and I owe it to myself and to the friends I have served with in the Philippines to correct this mistatement; and I have written to the editor of the Boston Post a letter which I have not seen yet. (The letter appeared next day.) It is as follows:
To the Editor of the "Post":

Dear Sir: In your report this morning of my speech at the 20th Century Club you have represented me as saying that Secretary Taft deceived the Filipino people. I did not say that. I said that Secretary Taft failed to undeceive the Filipino people. I have never said anything in any public utterance in this country inconsistent with what Mr. Bryan said at Manila, that the intentions of the administration were good. I am not an incendiary. I think that this question ought to be settled among our public men. Mr. Taft believes that the Filipinos should be held in tutelage indefinitely. Mr. Bryan believes that they should be allowed to pursue happiness in their own way. This is the issue.

I came home from the Philippines with the regrets of that government, and, further, with an endorsement by the Governor-General of my fitness, from what he had seen of my administration, for the position of United States District Judge in my own State, in event of Judge Speer's promotion to the Circuit bench.

✓ Judge Taft is too valuable a man for the disciples of Thomas Jefferson to attack him in the wrong way. I should be very proud to have Judge Taft as a guest in my own home. I have never said that he deceived the Filipinos. I have only said that he failed to undeceive them as to their hopes for ultimate

independence, held out by Secretary Root at the Republican National Convention of 1904.

Very respectfully,

James H. Blount.

Boston, October 21, 1906.

The situation in the Philippines is very difficult to present in a short limit of time. As Gov. Taft said to the Senate Committee in February, 1902: "When a man has been out there two years and become saturated with the subject; anywhere you tap him he runs." The central thought I would lodge with you is this: It has been a game of battle-door and shuttle-cock in which selfish interests at home and political considerations inherent in our form of government have worked to the detriment of the Filipino people. The Filipinos saw in the Peace Protocol of August 12, 1898, a cloud on the horizon no larger than a man's hand. There was a string tied to the Philippines. But I shall hurry on to the present as quickly as is consistent with clearness. Between the Battle of Manila Bay and the Peace Protocol was "the era of good feeling." It was then possible for Americans to see that the Filipinos were capable of running a government of their own. They hailed us as deliverers. Admiral Dewey cabled the government that they were more capable of self-government than the Cubans. Then later came the clash of arms because evidently then it was a question simply of a change of masters. The Schurman Commission came out with the olive branch and got there too late. If, day after day, and in night attacks too, you are "up against" a people who fight game and die game and dying cry: "Viva la Republica Filipina!" you have no doubt that they know what they want. It is impossible to convince the Secretary of War of that. He has never grasped the fundamental fact of the situation that those people will never be content with something less than independence. The general yearning for a national life of their own is the most tremendous fact in the situation. In four years on the bench in the Philippines, I have heard as much eloquent argument and seen cases as well prepared by members of the Filipino Bar as a circuit judge in this country would in the same length of time. Each of those lawyers has a wide circle of clients. In many cases those lawyers were colonels or generals or other officers in the insurgent army. The great inarticulate masses of the people look to

them for their opinions and advice. They say: "We know you, we trust you, we have fought under you. You tell us that the intentions of the American Government toward us are good. What are those intentions? Can you tell us?" No, the lawyer cannot tell them, because the American Government has never declared its intentions. If he was in a position to tell them it would be different. He cannot control their agitation. He is a power among them, and could incite them to revolt, but he cannot keep down manifestations of discontent. This is the true theory upon which to account for a large part of this post bellum brigandage representing, as I say, the embers of a late war. But once the representative lawyer of a community should tell his clients what the intentions of this government are; ipso facto, most of the unrest in the Philippines will at once stop. In the public press an account of a letter of Secretary Taft to the Bishop of Massachusetts was given which replied to the question: "Why not make a declaration of our purpose now?" substantially thus: "The gentlemen who are now agitating for independence, if you made such a declaration, would agitate a good deal more actively than ever with a view of hastening the day." The reply of Mr. Bryan's friends to that is this: "Fix the date!" In other words, if you say to this wide circle of Filipinos referred to: "You may hope to live to see the independence of your country," that will be sufficient. I would not undertake to fix the time. We have had it all the way from Mr. Bryan's five or ten or fifteen years to Senator Newland's and Senator Dubois's thirty years. But the main question is to fix a date. The main thing is to declare the purpose, to disclaim any intention of exercising permanent sovereignty and declare that purpose now. And I am reminded that Senator Beveridge hurled at us from Minneapolis this crushing denunciation: "Men said yesterday, let us do with the Filipinos as we have done with the Cubans. What man says that today?" Senator Beveridge said this in the same speech in which he made his fire-eating, land-grabbing declaration as to our duty at once to annex Cuba. But on the other hand Mr. Roosevelt sent Secretary Taft there and upon arrival we behold him making that magnificent statement with regard to the hopes of the Cuban people: "I have come, not to destroy, but to fulfil." The only two occasions in recorded history where any nation has ever applied the code of private morality to its international law were, first when by direction

of the President, Gen. Wood hauled down at Havana the flag which he and Mr. Roosevelt had put up; the second, when Gov. Taft said in the name and by the authority of that same President: "We are intervening to assist and not to appropriate." It was the most splendid victory that has ever occurred in this great contest of true patriotism against jingoism; alias Beveridgeism.

There is another thing which is an essential element of the situation. Some gentleman has said that the main trouble in getting out of the Philippines was that we must "save our face." The man who brought the Japanese-Russian War to a close can, in a few months get up a neutralization treaty with all the great powers, whereby the future status of the Philippine Islands shall be the same as that of Switzerland or Belgium today.

The Taft Commission came out to undertake the same futile task that the Schurman Commission undertook. Gov. Taft was not then a judge. However eminent, able and just a judge he may have been while on the Circuit Bench, he was a loyal partisan of the Republican Party, anxious to see it continued in power. The presidential election was coming on in the fall following. News from the Philippines was bad. The situation was not as well in hand as Gen. Otis would have had you believe. Optimistic news was needed and Judge Taft did not disappoint his friends at home. The Civil Commission had not been there more than sixty days before they sent this telegram: "A great majority of the people long for peace and are entirely willing to accept the establishment of a government under the supremacy of the United States." Gen. MacArthur, of course, learned their views after divers conferences with them, and modestly thought that, having been on the ground from the beginning, he ought to know more about the temper of the people than any five gentlemen, however eminent, who had just come out. But the Commission had paramount authority from the President; Gen. MacArthur was a soldier; he must yield to the unwise inevitable and let them set up their civil government whenever they so desired, but he could not help taking a parting shot at their theory. He said substantially that, aside from all other considerations, the unanimity of this people seems to be due to the curious reason that in matters of war or politics, people generally think they are never nearer right than when they stick to their own kith and kin and that the trouble was "ethnological homogeneity which appeals for a time to consanguinous

leadership!" Civil government of the provinces was set up before the insurrection was ever put down. Every officer of the United States Army who was there, knows that. It was put up as a political necessity. It was put up for the same reason that Uncle Remus made his rabbit climb the tree. You recollect the little boy to whom he used to tell these stories. In the one alluded to the rabbit had climbed a tree to escape the dog and thereby placed himself in a position of safety. The little boy reluctantly interrupts: "But, Uncle Remus, a rabbit can't climb a tree!" Uncle Remus promptly replied to the little boy substantially what Gov. Taft may be imagined to have said to Gen. MacArthur: "Oh, but, honey, dis rabbit des bleegeed ter climb dis tree." The Republican party was "des bleegeed ter climb" the tree of Civil Government. The civil government was set up, believing that public order would adjust itself. As a corollary to that the constabulary force was organized, the authorities believing that they could hold the situation down. I don't believe the best friend of Col. Baker would claim that his constabulary outfit had held the situation down. The constabulary has practiced reconcentration in a crude and defective manner. Gen. Bell was severely criticized on the floor of the United States Senate for his reconcentration in the Province of Batangas. I have been told in the last day or two by a newspaper man who was there that Gen. Bell fed the reconcentrados and that none of them died of starvation. The handling of large bodies of men and women is a thing that the regular army can do very successfully, but this is not so where reconcentration is practiced by the constabulary and civilians. Reconcentration under the military is one thing and reconcentration to be handled by unskilled people is another. This reconcentration law provides and recites that when it is not possible for the available police force constantly to provide protection for all the people, then reconcentration may be authorized. Think of such a recital in an American statute, when Mr. McKinley's letter to the Commission said: "I charge this commission to protect all of the people of the Philippine Islands all the time because it concerns the honor and conscience of their country." Where the band of brigands is operating through a wide section and the constabulary cannot handle the situation any other way, then the provincial governor issues an order substantially to this effect: "Before a certain day you must come within a radius of say two or three miles of the town

common and there remain until further orders." Thousands of people must come within the reconcentration zone in order that persons found outside thereafter may be properly treated as public enemies and dealt with as such. It does not take a lawyer to see that where you go into the rural districts and gather in the farmer and tell him to come to town carrying wife, children, bag and baggage, with no provision whatever for the working of his crop during his absence, he is being deprived of his property without due process of law. When he is dumped down on the town common and told to remain there it does not take a lawyer to see that he is being deprived of his liberty without due process of law. And yet the act of Congress known as the Philippine Government Bill of 1902, provided that no man in the Philippines can be deprived of life, liberty or property without due process of law. Now the constabulary and the handling of these people by the constabulary under the reconcentration law is a direct corollary of the fundamental mistake that the administration made in the Philippines, namely, the excessively optimistic belief that those people are or ever will be satisfied with something less than independence. It is the most pathetic fact in the whole situation, the general yearning of all the people of the Philippine Islands for a national life of their own.

I have been requested by friends to deal more with the autobiographical aspect of the situation, but have been so earnestly set upon demonstrating to the voters of the country the essentials of the problem as to have neglected what you might call "in lighter vein." I was holding court once in the Province of Albay, where this reconcentration business had coralled tens of thousands of people. Prof. Willis says 300,000 in his book. I don't know just how many, but a very great number of people. It was a gravely troublesome insurrection. An insurrection is called an insurrection colloquially in the Philippines, but never in the cablegrams. The Philippine Government Bill provides that the writ of habeas corpus may be suspended where public safety requires it. In order to suspend this writ you have got to call a spade a spade, an insurrection an insurrection, which the Philippine government does not like to do and will under no circumstances do on the eve of a presidential election. The insurrection to which I have referred was in progress in Albay from 1902 to 1903, one year. There were at times as many as 1,500 men in the field on each side

and this is the first time you ever heard of it. Yet civil government kept up and the writ of habeas corpus was not suspended. Under those circumstances, where the Judge of the Circuit earnestly and loyally holds up the civil government, amid the good humored jests of military friends, who insist you will have to turn the situation over to them sooner or later, and the people are crowded into jails by hundreds and the writ of habeas corpus is not suspended, the Judge becomes a sort of writ of habeas corpus incarnate. He must sort the sheep from the goats and either turn loose or convict as quickly as practicable, lest people awaiting trial die before he can get to them. I have the honor, if you will pardon a personal allusion, to have from the bar of my district a recommendation for the Supreme Bench which recites that the particular person whose interests they are presenting, has presided in three different provinces where insurrections were going on. In the Philippines we call a spade a spade. In the Philippines the inventor of phrases has done some very ingenious things. Those who are familiar with the management of the interior economy of the army know that certain things are classified as expendable and unexpendable, and when you are relieved from an army post by your successor you do not have to account for expendable property such as pencils, paper, etc., etc., but only for shovels, picks, etc., etc., which are in the unexpendable class and have always to be accounted for. It has become the practice in the Philippines now, when the constabulary goes on an expedition for the newspapers in Manila quietly and demurely and without any excitement to tell you how many Pulahanes the recent expedition "expended."

The Albay insurrection was headed by a man named Ola. The Filipinos are a very affectionate people, kindly, considerate, thoughtful. Ola was the head of the insurrection. He was finally induced to surrender and come in. He was sentenced to thirty years in the penitentiary, but having been of great service to the government in identifying his former followers and in the matter of state's evidence, when the ship was sent to carry the prisoners to Manila, Ola was not chained. And therefore you will understand the fact that there was an entente cordiale between us. During the night the stateroom grew too warm and I left it and went back to sleep in the back part of the ship near the stern steering gear. During the night I awoke, and just how I don't know, but it came to my conscious-

ness that there was a head on the other side of the pillow, and I looked, and lo and behold there was the bandit chief, my friend Ola! I said: "What are you doing here?" and he immediately jumped up and went away. I recollect coming from time to time to semi-consciousness, only to see that Ola was pacing up and down the deck. He was evidently a sentinel for me. Toward morning the constabulary guard guarding him begun to chatter. Ola was a man who had commanded men, and he proceeded at once to take charge of his guard and order them to keep quiet, as the judge was sleeping! Ola has since been pardoned.

I must not say good-bye to you without clearing up one misapprehension, because I am willing to give the devil his due. I have a letter received recently from one of the most eminent members of the bar of your city in which he asks a very personal question. "It has been alleged that the commission has tried to influence the courts. I do not know whether this is true, but if you can throw any light on it the reply will be welcomed." I can say that the lawyers who have charge of the Philippine government have never been guilty of any unprofessional conduct. However, the one thing which we are all, without one dissenting voice, agreed upon, is that the circuit judges in the Philippines should be commissioned by the President of the United States and not by the local government. The attorney-general of the Philippine Islands and the Secretary of War, and the most enthusiastic supporter of Mr. Bryan, all agree on that proposition.

I must close with one further remark. Without putting myself upon the witness stand you can readily see that if you bring together hundreds and thousands of people under the reconcentration law, herding together the ignorant peasant, and his wife, still more ignorant and more helpless, and his children, born and to be born, and his old people tottering toward the latter end, some of them are going to die of exposure, bad sanitation or hunger, before the period of reconcentration ends.

And, seeing that the constabulary reconcentration law, and other errors have caused in the Philippines much absolutely unnecessary sacrifice of life, I cannot but repeat now what Senator Hoar said in his last pathetic public protest on the floor of the Senate: "We have got nothing but honor out of Cuba. We have got nothing of honor out of the Philippines."

MR. STOREY.

Mr. Blount has said that one who has been in the Philippines for a number of years is so full of his subject that you only have to tap him and he will run. It occurs to me that some of the members here might like to ask some questions.

REV. J. L. TRYON.

I cannot quite understand the motive of these brigands. I think the most of us in this country, when we are told of the constabulary or army officers having to suppress brigandage, are disinclined to sympathize with the immediate freedom of the Philippines,—the fear being that as outlaws we cannot depend upon them. You speak of them as being embers of the fire of civil war. I think it might help me and others if you would explain just what you mean by that.

JUDGE BLOUNT.

I can reply to that and tell you what the sheriff of my court in Samar said. He was not as active as he might have been in pursuing the brigands who were out in the hills, because his favorite expression with reference to them was (not to us Americans, but when he supposed it would not reach our ears): "I don't think it my duty to persecute my brethren in the hills." They had served under him in the war. The feeling of brotherhood between the sheriff of the court and the brigands was strong.

MR. TRYON.

Did they prey upon their own people and try to make them come round to their views of "independence?" Is that something like the strikers?

JUDGE BLOUNT.

I would not for a moment have you to understand me that there are not brigands pure and simple in the Philippines, because there are, but to say that the brigandage in the Philippines does not to a large extent represent the embers of the late war is to totally misrepresent the key to the situation. The

insurrection for instance in Samar represented discontent with the tax gatherer and usurer and a desire in some feeble inarticulate way to manifest the sullen depths of their discontent with American rule. The intelligent men, the leaders of the people have recognized the futility of fighting long ago and come in,—Agninaldo and others,—but many have never returned to the paths of peace. This very insurrection in Samar I was able to get to the bottom of, and I found that the nucleus of it was a band of 100 men who had come from the Island of Biliran under the leadership of an ex-soldier, and it was still going on in 1904 and on through 1905. The nucleus of that brigand outbreak was the 100 men who had been in the late war. It is not therefore fair to characterize brigandage as entirely non-political, because if you tell the sheriff of the court of Samar to tell his people that on such and such a date in the future the American Government, having already disclaimed sovereignty, they are to be free and independent, that those of them having a reasonable expectancy of life may hope to see the independence of their country, the brigandage in Samar will stop.

PROF. H. B. SPRAGUE.

I should like to ask if this reconcentration policy is now operative in the Islands?

JUDGE BLOUNT.

In operation and a part of the statute law of the land.

PROF. SPRAGUE.

Can any fair estimate be made of the number of lives lost or deaths caused by this?

JUDGE BLOUNT.

My friend Gen. Allen reports that he killed 1,297 last year.

MR. STOREY.

You will remember that during the Boer War there was much talk in England against the policy of reconcentration in

South Africa. There was issued each month a "blue book" giving an excellent record of the whole number of people reconcentrated and the absolute loss of life in every camp. This "blue book" stated what private property had been destroyed, on what date, by whom and for what reason, down to fences, down to bales of hay, and other things of that sort, so that the English public were always advised of what was being done in their name in South Africa. I wrote a letter to the Insular Department asking information upon this matter in the Philippines and received in a day or two a reply stating that my letter had been referred to the Civil Commission for inquiry and report. I observed in the newspapers that the editors of the Manila "El Renacimiento" had been prosecuted for libel in making publication of some correspondence concerning the details of reconcentration soon after. That seemed to be the action which the Commission took upon my inquiry. The prosecution was pursued in the criminal courts and resulted in the acquittal of the editors. Emboldened by that, I again addressed the Insular Department and called their attention to the fact that I had received no reply to my letter. I was then advised that such reports as were available would be found in their annual publications, and they sent me a set. Then I called their attention to the fact that these "blue books" had been published in England, and I wanted to know if anywhere there were any statistics which would show how many camps there had been, how many people had been exposed to that practice, and how many had perished under it, as I found that there were no such records in these reports. I am unanswered. We are left to guess what the probable results must be of taking something like 300,000 people away, herding them in camps and leaving them to live or die. At the annual meeting of the League I shall be inclined to lay before you that correspondence so that you may see for yourself what the state of affairs is.

PROF. WILLIAM JAMES.

Can you tell us whether there is any reconcentration actually being applied now in the Philippines?

JUDGE BLOUNT.

There has not been reconcentration under the Constabulary

to any extent except in Albay in 1903 and in Samar in 1904, and in Cavite, near Manila, in 1905. That is to say this unsportsmanlike reconcentration of my friend Baker. The reconcentration of Gen. Bell in Batangas was under the military in 1901.

Mr. Storey called upon Mr. William Lloyd Garrison.

MR. WILLIAM LLOYD GARRISON'S REMARKS.

We have listened to the matured opinions of our guest, Judge Blount, of Georgia, resulting from long experience in the Philippines. They reflect the sober second thought now gathering head throughout the land. The prophecies of the soothsayers have been falsified and the glamour of war has passed while its ghastliness remains. Voices of shame and humiliation multiply where recent protests against imperialism were deemed the utterances of treason. Commercial loss and the forfeiture of self-respect indicate that the day of sackcloth and ashes is approaching.

The conscious effort to forget, if not to atone for the nation's criminal aggression, is suddenly jarred by the Bourbon tones of Dr. Lyman Abbott. From the seclusion of Lake Mohonk come these assertive words, befitting a mind beyond the power to forget or learn:

"I believe the proudest chapter in our history is that written by the statesmanship of McKinley, the guns of Dewey, and the administration of Taft. There is nothing to repent, nothing to retract; our duty is to go on and complete the work already so well begun. I do not defend or apologize for what we have done in the Philippines. I glory in it. We must give them a government, not for our benefit, but primarily for the benefit of the Filipinos."

The proudest chapter in our history! Ten years ago the chapter that included the emancipation of four million slaves held that distinction. The chapter viewed with pride by Dr. Abbott includes the betrayal of trusting allies, the annihilation of half a million of people struggling for independence, the repudiation of American ideals, the monstrous increase of armaments and the assumption of despotic power by the President. From the atmosphere of Lincoln we have sunk to this, and the glib phrases coined by empire makers have debased the cur-

rency of speech in the United States. In this accomplishment the successor of Henry Ward Beecher now "glories." And it is easier to glory in than to defend or apologize for a chapter of disgrace. Who doubts that this apostate era will bear the stamp of inglorious when its true historian arrives?

With the revised judgment of events will follow a new estimate of reputations. It will be truthfully written that an unprincipled plutocrat with shameless daily presses stirred to the depths the depraved element of the country—perhaps the most powerful influence that forced the war with Spain. It can be said with equal truth that the editor of the "Outlook," a preacher of the gospel of peace, the ethical favorite of philanthropic convocations and college pulpits, after the event, exercised even a greater power,—drugging the public conscience and with pious sophistry demoralizing the great constituency which takes its religion and politics from his fluent and machiavelian pen. Into how many households has this weekly perversion of principles found its way, confusing issues, weakening moral standards and cultivating that bourgeois complacency which stands behind the heathen war-cry, "Our country right or wrong!"

In comparison with Dr. Abbott and his like appear the executioners who, when the conflict was precipitated, led in the slaughter of the victims. But Bell and Funston and Wood simply followed their professional calling.

"Theirs not to make reply,
Theirs not to reason why,"

and, from the standpoint of legalized murder, they were in the line of duty. They made no altruistic pretences, were embarrassed by no scruples of abstract justice or fear of infringing constitutional safeguards. They stand in the category of Thackeray's "red coat bully in his boots who hides the march of men from us." By their own yardstick they have a right to claim measurement.

But a different method of judgment is reserved for the teacher of ethics. The moral law is unswerving, and by its verdict, though titles of divinity adorn his name, the offender must, in the last analysis, abide.

The prototypes of Dr. Abbott are prominent in every past struggle for human rights. They included men of learning and position, model husbands and fathers, and of lovely neighborhood repute. Yet, without them and their influence tyranny

would have lacked its necessary defence and shelter. The popularity of their day has turned to censure or pity under the transforming touch of the impartial historian. Their own posterity is careful to forget the unsavory episodes which make ancestral names so tryingly persistent.

If the desire of Dr. Abbott to give the Filipinos a government for their own benefit be held to modify his endorsement of our calamitous career in their devastated islands, the wish is a belated one. It was in order before the hundreds of thousands now in graves because of our fateful coming were beyond the reach of patronizing benevolence.

“Spirit of Kant! have we not had enough
To make Religion sad and sour and snubbish,”
without further theological attempts to hide the nakedness of imperialism under the garments of Christianity?

In a similar period of national debasement, when loyalty to truth demanded disloyalty to ruling powers, Wendell Phillips rejoiced in being “infidel to a church that could be at peace in the presence of sin; traitor to a government that was a magnificent conspiracy against justice.” It was a noble expression of divine faith. And in this season of spiritual drought, the faithlessness in organized church and state, remembering the swift reversal of verdict that followed the triumph of the anti-slavery cause, the opponents of present established wrongs can confidently await “the safe appeal of truth to time.”

MR. STOREY.

I should like to add that Gen. Funston and Gen. Bell were soldiers in the army of the United States. They obeyed the orders of their commander-in-chief and are excused. Dr. Abbott is an officer in the army of Christ. Has he obeyed the orders of his commander-in-chief, and can he be excused?

We shall be glad to hear from any other gentleman present who would like to say something. If not, I would suggest that the attendance of all is desired at our annual meeting which takes place in five or six weeks.

The meeting was dissolved.



*You are earnestly asked to hand this,
after reading, to some other person who
will also give it careful consideration.*

PROCEEDINGS
FOLLOWING THE LUNCHEON
GIVEN BY THE
Anti-Imperialist League
MONDAY, OCTOBER 22
AT THE ROOMS OF THE TWENTIETH
CENTURY CLUB
TO
Hon. James H. Blount

PUBLISHED BY
THE ANTI-IMPERIALIST LEAGUE
20 CENTRAL STREET, BOSTON

No. 571 - 1st LEAD
1875-1880

E713
A655

701 13 146

PROCEEDINGS

Mr. Moorfield Storey called the meeting to order.

MR. MOORFIELD STOREY'S REMARKS

Ladies and Gentlemen of the Anti-Imperialist League: It is very pleasant to meet you here in such goodly numbers as we begin a new annual campaign of active agitation in favor of Filipino independence. On this occasion we are here to provide ourselves with fresh ammunition. From your experience with me you know that on most occasions I am not averse to speaking, but on this occasion, I am here to listen. I believe that there are two serious vices into which a presiding officer may readily fall. One is to introduce the speaker of the evening in a speech of such length as more or less to take away the freshness of the speaker's ammunition and the other is to talk about it from an entirely erroneous standpoint, so that the speaker is obliged to spend his time in correcting the mistakes that may have been made; so I shall content myself with introducing to you Judge Blount.

JUDGE BLOUNT'S SPEECH.

It is a matter of very great concern to me that I shall say nothing in this country that I shall be ashamed for my friends in the Philippines to hear. When you have served beyond the seas for six or seven years you have grown close to the people over there. "I have eaten their bread and salt. The deaths that they died I have watched beside and the lives that they led were mine." Therefore, I have determined that I shall say nothing except in a spirit of judicial fairness about the situation there. I am an Anti-Imperialist for the reason that "I do not know the method of drawing an indictment against a whole people." To be specific, in the fall of 1904, during the presidential campaign in the United States, there was an insurrection going on in the Island of Samar. Fifty thousand people

had been made homeless by the operations of a band of brigands, as testified before my court by an officer of the constabulary of that province. The brigandage law is an outgrowth first of the sedition law and, with all due respect to the Secretary of War, it is absolutely an untenable position to say that there is no political significance to the brigandage now going on in those islands. It is simply to deny the proposition that post-bellum brigandage always represents the embers of a late war. Now if the Secretary can prove that to you, he can do more than any public man that I know of in the world. In what I shall say I shall try to be fair; and before going further, permit me to say that I was very much pained to find that one of your Boston papers had not correctly quoted me in what I said last Saturday at the luncheon of the 20th Century Club, and I owe it to myself and to the friends I have served with in the Philippines to correct this mistatement; and I have written to the editor of the Boston Post a letter which I have not seen yet. (The letter appeared next day.) It is as follows:
To the Editor of the "Post":

Dear Sir: In your report this morning of my speech at the 20th Century Club you have represented me as saying that Secretary Taft deceived the Filipino people. I did not say that. I said that Secretary Taft failed to undeceive the Filipino people. I have never said anything in any public utterance in this country inconsistent with what Mr. Bryan said at Manila, that the intentions of the administration were good. I am not an incendiary. I think that this question ought to be settled among our public men. Mr. Taft believes that the Filipinos should be held in tutelage indefinitely. Mr. Bryan believes that they should be allowed to pursue happiness in their own way. This is the issue.

I came home from the Philippines with the regrets of that government, and, further, with an endorsement by the Governor-General of my fitness, from what he had seen of my administration, for the position of United States District Judge in my own State, in event of Judge Speer's promotion to the Circuit bench.

✓✓ Judge Taft is too valuable a man for the disciples of Thomas Jefferson to attack him in the wrong way. I should be very proud to have Judge Taft as a guest in my own home. I have never said that he deceived the Filipinos. I have only said that he failed to undeceive them as to their hopes for ultimate

independence, held out by Secretary Root at the Republican National Convention of 1904.

Very respectfully,

James H. Blount.

Boston, October 21, 1906.

The situation in the Philippines is very difficult to present in a short limit of time. As Gov. Taft said to the Senate Committee in February, 1902: "When a man has been out there two years and become saturated with the subject; anywhere you tap him he runs." The central thought I would lodge with you is this: It has been a game of battle-door and shuttle-cock in which selfish interests at home and political considerations inherent in our form of government have worked to the detriment of the Filipino people. The Filipinos saw in the Peace Protocol of August 12, 1898, a cloud on the horizon no larger than a man's hand. There was a string tied to the Philippines. But I shall hurry on to the present as quickly as is consistent with clearness. Between the Battle of Manila Bay and the Peace Protocol was "the era of good feeling." It was then possible for Americans to see that the Filipinos were capable of running a government of their own. They hailed us as deliverers. Admiral Dewey cabled the government that they were more capable of self-government than the Cubans. Then later came the clash of arms because evidently then it was a question simply of a change of masters. The Schurman Commission came out with the olive branch and got there too late. If, day after day, and in night attacks too, you are "up against" a people who fight game and die game and dying cry: "Viva la Republica Filipina!" you have no doubt that they know what they want. It is impossible to convince the Secretary of War of that. He has never grasped the fundamental fact of the situation that those people will never be content with something less than independence. The general yearning for a national life of their own is the most tremendous fact in the situation. In four years on the bench in the Philippines, I have heard as much eloquent argument and seen cases as well prepared by members of the Filipino Bar as a circuit judge in this country would in the same length of time. Each of those lawyers has a wide circle of clients. In many cases those lawyers were colonels or generals or other officers in the insurgent army. The great inarticulate masses of the people look to

them for their opinions and advice. They say: "We know you, we trust you, we have fought under you. You tell us that the intentions of the American Government toward us are good. What are those intentions? Can you tell us?" No, the lawyer cannot tell them, because the American Government has never declared its intentions. If he was in a position to tell them it would be different. He cannot control their agitation. He is a power among them, and could incite them to revolt, but he cannot keep down manifestations of discontent. This is the true theory upon which to account for a large part of this post bellum brigandage representing, as I say, the embers of a late war. But once the representative lawyer of a community should tell his clients what the intentions of this government are; ipso facto, most of the unrest in the Philippines will at once stop. In the public press an account of a letter of Secretary Taft to the Bishop of Massachusetts was given which replied to the question: "Why not make a declaration of our purpose now?" substantially thus: "The gentlemen who are now agitating for independence, if you made such a declaration, would agitate a good deal more actively than ever with a view of hastening the day." The reply of Mr. Bryan's friends to that is this: "Fix the date!" In other words, if you say to this wide circle of Filipinos referred to: "You may hope to live to see the independence of your country," that will be sufficient. I would not undertake to fix the time. We have had it all the way from Mr. Bryan's five or ten or fifteen years to Senator Newland's and Senator Dubois's thirty years. But the main question is to fix a date. The main thing is to declare the purpose, to disclaim any intention of exercising permanent sovereignty and declare that purpose now. And I am reminded that Senator Beveridge hurled at us from Minneapolis this crushing denunciation: "Men said yesterday, let us do with the Filipinos as we have done with the Cubans. What man says that today?" Senator Beveridge said this in the same speech in which he made his fire-eating, land-grabbing declaration as to our duty at once to annex Cuba. But on the other hand Mr. Roosevelt sent Secretary Taft there and upon arrival we behold him making that magnificent statement with regard to the hopes of the Cuban people: "I have come, not to destroy, but to fulfil." The only two occasions in recorded history where any nation has ever applied the code of private morality to its international law were, first when by direction

of the President, Gen. Wood hauled down at Havana the flag which he and Mr. Roosevelt had put up; the second, when Gov. Taft said in the name and by the authority of that same President: "We are intervening to assist and not to appropriate." It was the most splendid victory that has ever occurred in this great contest of true patriotism against jingoism; alias Beveridgeism. /

There is another thing which is an essential element of the situation. Some gentleman has said that the main trouble in getting out of the Philippines was that we must "save our face." The man who brought the Japanese-Russian War to a close can, in a few months get up a neutralization treaty with all the great powers, whereby the future status of the Philippine Islands shall be the same as that of Switzerland or Belgium today. /

The Taft Commission came out to undertake the same futile task that the Schurman Commission undertook. Gov. Taft was not then a judge. However eminent, able and just a judge he may have been while on the Circuit Bench, he was a loyal partisan of the Republican Party, anxious to see it continued in power. The presidential election was coming on in the fall following. News from the Philippines was bad. The situation was not as well in hand as Gen. Otis would have had you believe. Optimistic news was needed and Judge Taft did not disappoint his friends at home. The Civil Commission had not been there more than sixty days before they sent this telegram: "A great majority of the people long for peace and are entirely willing to accept the establishment of a government under the supremacy of the United States." Gen. MacArthur, of course, learned their views after divers conferences with them, and modestly thought that, having been on the ground from the beginning, he ought to know more about the temper of the people than any five gentlemen, however eminent, who had just come out. But the Commission had paramount authority from the President; Gen. MacArthur was a soldier; he must yield to the unwise inevitable and let them set up their civil government whenever they so desired, but he could not help taking a parting shot at their theory. He said substantially that, aside from all other considerations, the unanimity of this people seems to be due to the curious reason that in matters of war or politics, people generally think they are never nearer right than when they stick to their own kith and kin and that the trouble was "ethnological homogeneity which appeals for a time to consanguinious

leadership!" Civil government of the provinces was set up before the insurrection was ever put down. Every officer of the United States Army who was there, knows that. It was put up as a political necessity. It was put up for the same reason that Uncle Remus made his rabbit climb the tree. You recollect the little boy to whom he used to tell these stories. In the one alluded to the rabbit had climbed a tree to escape the dog and thereby placed himself in a position of safety. The little boy reluctantly interrupts: "But, Uncle Remus, a rabbit can't climb a tree!" Uncle Remus promptly replied to the little boy substantially what Gov. Taft may be imagined to have said to Gen. MacArthur: "Oh, but, honey, dis rabbit des bleegeed ter climb dis tree." The Republican party was "des bleegeed ter climb" the tree of Civil Government. The civil government was set up, believing that public order would adjust itself. As a corollary to that the constabulary force was organized, the authorities believing that they could hold the situation down. I don't believe the best friend of Col. Baker would claim that his constabulary outfit had held the situation down. The constabulary has practiced reconcentration in a crude and defective manner. Gen. Bell was severely criticized on the floor of the United States Senate for his reconcentration in the Province of Batangas. I have been told in the last day or two by a newspaper man who was there that Gen. Bell fed the reconcentrados and that none of them died of starvation. The handling of large bodies of men and women is a thing that the regular army can do very successfully, but this is not so where reconcentration is practiced by the constabulary and civilians. Reconcentration under the military is one thing and reconcentration to be handled by unskilled people is another. This reconcentration law provides and recites that when it is not possible for the available police force constantly to provide protection for all the people, then reconcentration may be authorized. Think of such a recital in an American statute, when Mr. McKinley's letter to the Commission said: "I charge this commission to protect all of the people of the Philippine Islands all the time because it concerns the honor and conscience of their country." Where the band of brigands is operating through a wide section and the constabulary cannot handle the situation any other way, then the provincial governor issues an order substantially to this effect: "Before a certain day you must come within a radius of say two or three miles of the town

common and there remain until further orders." Thousands of people must come within the reconcentration zone in order that persons found outside thereafter may be properly treated as public enemies and dealt with as such. It does not take a lawyer to see that where you go into the rural districts and gather in the farmer and tell him to come to town carrying wife, children, bag and baggage, with no provision whatever for the working of his crop during his absence, he is being deprived of his property without due process of law. When he is dumped down on the town common and told to remain there it does not take a lawyer to see that he is being deprived of his liberty without due process of law. And yet the act of Congress known as the Philippine Government Bill of 1902, provided that no man in the Philippines can be deprived of life, liberty or property without due process of law. Now the constabulary and the handling of these people by the constabulary under the reconcentration law is a direct corollary of the fundamental mistake that the administration made in the Philippines, namely, the excessively optimistic belief that those people are or ever will be satisfied with something less than independence. It is the most pathetic fact in the whole situation, the general yearning of all the people of the Philippine Islands for a national life of their own.

I have been requested by friends to deal more with the autobiographical aspect of the situation, but have been so earnestly set upon demonstrating to the voters of the country the essentials of the problem as to have neglected what you might call "in lighter vein." I was holding court once in the Province of Albay, where this reconcentration business had coralled tens of thousands of people. Prof. Willis says 300,000 in his book. I don't know just how many, but a very great number of people. It was a gravely troublesome insurrection. An insurrection is called an insurrection colloquially in the Philippines, but never in the cablegrams. The Philippine Government Bill provides that the writ of habeas corpus may be suspended where public safety requires it. In order to suspend this writ you have got to call a spade a spade, an insurrection an insurrection, which the Philippine government does not like to do and will under no circumstances do on the eve of a presidential election. The insurrection to which I have referred was in progress in Albay from 1902 to 1903, one year. There were at times as many as 1,500 men in the field on each side

and this is the first time you ever heard of it. Yet civil government kept up and the writ of habeas corpus was not suspended. Under those circumstances, where the Judge of the Circuit earnestly and loyally holds up the civil government, amid the good humored jests of military friends, who insist you will have to turn the situation over to them sooner or later, and the people are crowded into jails by hundreds and the writ of habeas corpus is not suspended, the Judge becomes a sort of writ of habeas corpus incarnate. He must sort the sheep from the goats and either turn loose or convict as quickly as practicable, lest people awaiting trial die before he can get to them. I have the honor, if you will pardon a personal allusion, to have from the bar of my district a recommendation for the Supreme Bench which recites that the particular person whose interests they are presenting, has presided in three different provinces where insurrections were going on. In the Philippines we call a spade a spade. In the Philippines the inventor of phrases has done some very ingenious things. Those who are familiar with the management of the interior economy of the army know that certain things are classified as expendable and unexpendable, and when you are relieved from an army post by your successor you do not have to account for expendable property such as pencils, paper, etc., etc., but only for shovels, picks, etc., etc., which are in the unexpendable class and have always to be accounted for. It has become the practice in the Philippines now, when the constabulary goes on an expedition for the newspapers in Manila quietly and demurely and without any excitement to tell you how many Pulahanes the recent expedition "expended."

The Albay insurrection was headed by a man named Ola. The Filipinos are a very affectionate people, kindly, considerate, thoughtful. Ola was the head of the insurrection. He was finally induced to surrender and come in. He was sentenced to thirty years in the penitentiary, but having been of great service to the government in identifying his former followers and in the matter of state's evidence, when the ship was sent to carry the prisoners to Manila, Ola was not chained. And therefore you will understand the fact that there was an entente cordiale between us. During the night the stateroom grew too warm and I left it and went back to sleep in the back part of the ship near the stern steering gear. During the night I awoke, and just how I don't know, but it came to my conscious-

ness that there was a head on the other side of the pillow, and I looked, and lo and behold there was the bandit chief, my friend Ola! I said: "What are you doing here?" and he immediately jumped up and went away. I recollect coming from time to time to semi-consciousness, only to see that Ola was pacing up and down the deck. He was evidently a sentinel for me. Toward morning the constabulary guard guarding him begun to chatter. Ola was a man who had commanded men, and he proceeded at once to take charge of his guard and order them to keep quiet, as the judge was sleeping! Ola has since been pardoned.

I must not say good-bye to you without clearing up one misapprehension, because I am willing to give the devil his due. I have a letter received recently from one of the most eminent members of the bar of your city in which he asks a very personal question. "It has been alleged that the commission has tried to influence the courts. I do not know whether this is true, but if you can throw any light on it the reply will be welcomed." I can say that the lawyers who have charge of the Philippine government have never been guilty of any unprofessional conduct. However, the one thing which we are all, without one dissenting voice, agreed upon, is that the circuit judges in the Philippines should be commissioned by the President of the United States and not by the local government. The attorney-general of the Philippine Islands and the Secretary of War, and the most enthusiastic supporter of Mr. Bryan, all agree on that proposition.

I must close with one further remark. Without putting myself upon the witness stand you can readily see that if you bring together hundreds and thousands of people under the reconcentration law, herding together the ignorant peasant, and his wife, still more ignorant and more helpless, and his children, born and to be born, and his old people tottering toward the latter end, some of them are going to die of exposure, bad sanitation or hunger, before the period of reconcentration ends.

And, seeing that the constabulary reconcentration law, and other errors have caused in the Philippines much absolutely unnecessary sacrifice of life, I cannot but repeat now what Senator Hoar said in his last pathetic public protest on the floor of the Senate: "We have got nothing but honor out of Cuba. We have got nothing of honor out of the Philippines."

MR. STOREY.

Mr. Blount has said that one who has been in the Philippines for a number of years is so full of his subject that you only have to tap him and he will run. It occurs to me that some of the members here might like to ask some questions.

REV. J. L. TRYON.

I cannot quite understand the motive of these brigands. I think the most of us in this country, when we are told of the constabulary or army officers having to suppress brigandage, are disinclined to sympathize with the immediate freedom of the Philippines,—the fear being that as outlaws we cannot depend upon them. You speak of them as being embers of the fire of civil war. I think it might help me and others if you would explain just what you mean by that.

JUDGE BLOUNT.

I can reply to that and tell you what the sheriff of my court in Samar said. He was not as active as he might have been in pursuing the brigands who were out in the hills, because his favorite expression with reference to them was (not to us Americans, but when he supposed it would not reach our ears): "I don't think it my duty to persecute my brethren in the hills." They had served under him in the war. The feeling of brotherhood between the sheriff of the court and the brigands was strong.

MR. TRYON.

Did they prey upon their own people and try to make them come round to their views of "independence?" Is that something like the strikers?

JUDGE BLOUNT.

I would not for a moment have you to understand me that there are not brigands pure and simple in the Philippines, because there are, but to say that the brigandage in the Philippines does not to a large extent represent the embers of the late war is to totally misrepresent the key to the situation. The

insurrection for instance in Samar represented discontent with the tax gatherer and usurer and a desire in some feeble inarticulate way to manifest the sullen depths of their discontent with American rule. The intelligent men, the leaders of the people have recognized the futility of fighting long ago and come in,—Aguinaldo and others,—but many have never returned to the paths of peace. This very insurrection in Samar I was able to get to the bottom of, and I found that the nucleus of it was a band of 100 men who had come from the Island of Biliran under the leadership of an ex-soldier, and it was still going on in 1904 and on through 1905. The nucleus of that brigand outbreak was the 100 men who had been in the late war. It is not therefore fair to characterize brigandage as entirely non-political, because if you tell the sheriff of the court of Samar to tell his people that on such and such a date in the future the American Government, having already disclaimed sovereignty, they are to be free and independent, that those of them having a reasonable expectancy of life may hope to see the independence of their country, the brigandage in Samar will stop.

PROF. H. B. SPRAGUE.

I should like to ask if this reconcentration policy is now operative in the Islands?

JUDGE BLOUNT.

In operation and a part of the statute law of the land.

PROF. SPRAGUE.

Can any fair estimate be made of the number of lives lost or deaths caused by this?

JUDGE BLOUNT.

My friend Gen. Allen reports that he killed 1,297 last year.

MR. STOREY.

You will remember that during the Boer War there was much talk in England against the policy of reconcentration in

South Africa. There was issued each month a "blue book" giving an excellent record of the whole number of people reconcentrated and the absolute loss of life in every camp. This "blue book" stated what private property had been destroyed, on what date, by whom and for what reason, down to fences, down to bales of hay, and other things of that sort, so that the English public were always advised of what was being done in their name in South Africa. I wrote a letter to the Insular Department asking information upon this matter in the Philippines and received in a day or two a reply stating that my letter had been referred to the Civil Commission for inquiry and report. I observed in the newspapers that the editors of the Manila "El Renacimiento" had been prosecuted for libel in making publication of some correspondence concerning the details of reconcentration soon after. That seemed to be the action which the Commission took upon my inquiry. The prosecution was pursued in the criminal courts and resulted in the acquittal of the editors. Emboldened by that, I again addressed the Insular Department and called their attention to the fact that I had received no reply to my letter. I was then advised that such reports as were available would be found in their annual publications, and they sent me a set. Then I called their attention to the fact that these "blue books" had been published in England, and I wanted to know if anywhere there were any statistics which would show how many camps there had been, how many people had been exposed to that practice, and how many had perished under it, as I found that there were no such records in these reports. I am unanswered. We are left to guess what the probable results must be of taking something like 300,000 people away, herding them in camps and leaving them to live or die. At the annual meeting of the League I shall be inclined to lay before you that correspondence so that you may see for yourself what the state of affairs is.

PROF. WILLIAM JAMES.

Can you tell us whether there is any reconcentration actually being applied now in the Philippines?

JUDGE BLOUNT.

There has not been reconcentration under the Constabulary

to any extent except in Albay in 1903 and in Samar in 1904, and in Cavite, near Manila, in 1905. That is to say this unsportsmanlike reconcentration of my friend Baker. The reconcentration of Gen. Bell in Batangas was under the military in 1901.

Mr. Storey called upon Mr. William Lloyd Garrison.

MR. WILLIAM LLOYD GARRISON'S REMARKS.

We have listened to the matured opinions of our guest, Judge Blount, of Georgia, resulting from long experience in the Philippines. They reflect the sober second thought now gathering head throughout the land. The prophecies of the soothsayers have been falsified and the glamour of war has passed while its ghastliness remains. Voices of shame and humiliation multiply where recent protests against imperialism were deemed the utterances of treason. Commercial loss and the forfeiture of self-respect indicate that the day of sackcloth and ashes is approaching.

The conscious effort to forget, if not to atone for the nation's criminal aggression, is suddenly jarred by the Bourbon tones of Dr. Lyman Abbott. From the seclusion of Lake Mohonk come these assertive words, befitting a mind beyond the power to forget or learn:

"I believe the proudest chapter in our history is that written by the statesmanship of McKinley, the guns of Dewey, and the administration of Taft. There is nothing to repent, nothing to retract; our duty is to go on and complete the work already so well begun. I do not defend or apologize for what we have done in the Philippines. I glory in it. We must give them a government, not for our benefit, but primarily for the benefit of the Filipinos."

The proudest chapter in our history! Ten years ago the chapter that included the emancipation of four million slaves held that distinction. The chapter viewed with pride by Dr. Abbott includes the betrayal of trusting allies, the annihilation of half a million of people struggling for independence, the repudiation of American ideals, the monstrous increase of armaments and the assumption of despotic power by the President. From the atmosphere of Lincoln we have sunk to this, and the glib phrases coined by empire makers have debased the cur-

rency of speech in the United States. In this accomplishment the successor of Henry Ward Beecher now "glories." And it is easier to glory in than to defend or apologize for a chapter of disgrace. Who doubts that this apostate era will bear the stamp of inglorious when its true historian arrives?

With the revised judgment of events will follow a new estimate of reputations. It will be truthfully written that an unprincipled plutocrat with shameless daily presses stirred to the depths the depraved element of the country—perhaps the most powerful influence that forced the war with Spain. It can be said with equal truth that the editor of the "Outlook," a preacher of the gospel of peace, the ethical favorite of philanthropic convocations and college pulpits, after the event, exercised even a greater power,—drugging the public conscience and with pious sophistry demoralizing the great constituency which takes its religion and politics from his fluent and machiavelian pen. Into how many households has this weekly perversion of principles found its way, confusing issues, weakening moral standards and cultivating that bourgeois complacency which stands behind the heathen war-cry, "Our country right or wrong!"

In comparison with Dr. Abbott and his like appear the executioners who, when the conflict was precipitated, led in the slaughter of the victims. But Bell and Funston and Wood simply followed their professional calling.

"Theirs not to make reply,
Theirs not to reason why,"

and, from the standpoint of legalized murder, they were in the line of duty. They made no altruistic pretences, were embarrassed by no scruples of abstract justice or fear of infringing constitutional safeguards. They stand in the category of Thackeray's "red coat bully in his boots who hides the march of men from us." By their own yardstick they have a right to claim measurement.

But a different method of judgment is reserved for the teacher of ethics. The moral law is unswerving, and by its verdict, though titles of divinity adorn his name, the offender must, in the last analysis, abide.

The prototypes of Dr. Abbott are prominent in every past struggle for human rights. They included men of learning and position, model husbands and fathers, and of lovely neighborhood repute. Yet, without them and their influence tyranny

would have lacked its necessary defence and shelter. The popularity of their day has turned to censure or pity under the transforming touch of the impartial historian. Their own posterity is careful to forget the unsavory episodes which make ancestral names so tryingly persistent.

If the desire of Dr. Abbott to give the Filipinos a government for their own benefit be held to modify his endorsement of our calamitous career in their devastated islands, the wish is a belated one. It was in order before the hundreds of thousands now in graves because of our fateful coming were beyond the reach of patronizing benevolence.

“Spirit of Kant! have we not had enough

To make Religion sad and sour and snubbish,”
without further theological attempts to hide the nakedness of imperialism under the garments of Christianity?

In a similar period of national debasement, when loyalty to truth demanded disloyalty to ruling powers, Wendell Phillips rejoiced in being “infidel to a church that could be at peace in the presence of sin; traitor to a government that was a magnificent conspiracy against justice.” It was a noble expression of divine faith. And in this season of spiritual drought, the faithlessness in organized church and state, remembering the swift reversal of verdict that followed the triumph of the anti-slavery cause, the opponents of present established wrongs can confidently await “the safe appeal of truth to time.”

MR. STOREY.

I should like to add that Gen. Funston and Gen. Bell were soldiers in the army of the United States. They obeyed the orders of their commander-in-chief and are excused. Dr. Abbott is an officer in the army of Christ. Has he obeyed the orders of his commander-in-chief, and can he be excused?

We shall be glad to hear from any other gentleman present who would like to say something. If not, I would suggest that the attendance of all is desired at our annual meeting which takes place in five or six weeks.

The meeting was dissolved.

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS



0 013 788 256 5

